DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 010 EC 150 034

AUTHOR Sharp, Bill; Watson, Pat
TITLE Evaluation of the Gifted and Talented Program, 1980-81.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma City Public Schools, OK. Dept. of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 35p.
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Research and Evaluation of the Oklahoma City Public Schools; v11 n2 Nov 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Gifted; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Special Programs; *Talent; *Talent Identification
IDENTIFIERS *Gifted Disadvantaged; Oklahoma (Oklahoma City)

ABSTRACT

A study involving 1,000 minority and limited English proficiency students was designed to gather descriptive data about the population served and analyze methods used to identify potential participants in the gifted and talented program in 15 elementary schools, 7 fifth year centers, and 6 middle schools. A combination of methods was used to identify students for the Oklahoma City Public Schools Gifted and Talented Program, including parent, professional, and student nominations; achievement, aptitude and interest test results; and student performance and interests. Among findings were that teacher nomination was used for most students in the gifted and talented program, and that 84% of the students in the gifted and talented program did not have individual educational programs. Conclusions were drawn regarding placement, activities, and development and dissemination. It was found that although the racial balance in the program was not the same as in the district, it seemed to the evaluator that a concerted effort was made to include minority and limited English proficiency students, both district wide and in each school. For most schools, as well as the district, the gifted and talented program consisted of an open ended curriculum which included individualized and group instruction in such areas as creativity, leadership, career exploration, and the arts. Appended are guidelines for the gifted/talented program and a program evaluation planning sheet. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

0622

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ED221010

EVALUATION OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM 1980-81

OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
THOMAS PAYZANT, SUPERINTENDENT
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

VOLUME 11. . . .NUMBER 2
NOVEMBER 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia J. Watabe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC150034

EVALUATION OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM 1980-81

By
Bill Sharp
Pat Watson

Planning, Research, and Evaluation Department
Oklahoma City Public Schools
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT
OF THE 1980-81
GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM
August, 1981

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluator: Bill Sharp

Program Description

In 1980-81, the gifted and talented program included fifteen elementary schools, seven fifth year centers, and six middle schools.

The 1980-81 program was to provide a variety of enrichment experiences to develop students to their full potential. Activities were to be tailored to each student's individual needs. Minority and limited English proficiency students were to be included in the 1,000 students being served.

To find potential Gifted and Talented students, a combination of methods including nominations, administering various measures of ability, as well as performance and interest, were to be used. The final decision about who was to be selected for the program was to be made by a placement team.

Design of the Study

Activities of the study centered around the use of a survey to gather descriptive data about the population served and analysis of the methods used to identify potential participants. Instructional strategies were also identified. The evaluator felt that these data could help program staff to explore the options and compare the program to state guidelines, prior to decisions about the 1981-82 Gifted and Talented Program.

In preparation for data collection, the evaluator met with the facilitators during four of their monthly meeting. Also, all gifted and talented facilitators were visited at least once at their school sites.

Findings

All ability areas were included in the district program; specifically: intellectual, creative thinking, leadership, visual arts, performing arts, creative writing, and other specific aptitude. However, in some schools, the pattern was restricted to only a few areas.

Placement

Within the district, there was extensive use of group or individual tests of intelligence and achievement, teacher nomination, information from parents, school grades, rating scales, scholastic aptitude tests, interest inventories, or nominations by professional staff to identify students. Again, some schools were much more limited in the number of criteria applied and interviews with Gifted and Talented facilitators indicated that some programs did not have placement teams. Although the racial balance in the program was not the same as in the district, there was evidence that a concerted effort was made to include minority and limited English proficiency students, both district-wide and in each school.

Activities

Teachers described activities for gifted and talented students in individual schools, as well as the district, as being typically "subject related, process-oriented, doing centered, open-ended, and student selected."

Responses from facilitators and teachers showed agreement that special materials, methods, and activities were chosen for the Gifted and Talented students distinct, different, and in addition to, those provided for the rest of the students throughout the school year.

The teacher survey indicated that time was allowed for some of the facilitators to work and plan with the regular classroom teacher. However some facilitors showed zero days and zero hours for this to take place.

Limitations

In interviews with facilitators, it was noted that, while most building facilitators were supportive of the program, some were not. Also, a need to clarify administrative roles (whether the building administration or curriculum administrator controlled and supervised the program) was expressed.

Recommendations

- A number of students who were eligible for the 1980-81 Gifted and Talented program will not be eligible under recent legislation. Therefore the district will need to move toward identification procedures which are consistent with the revised state policy.

- It was recommended by facilitators that they be provided testing in-service.

- Intensive dissemination and training in the new state guidelines and effective communication with and among facilitators should be emphasized in the 1981-82 program.

- Further clarification of roles, particularly related to supervision of facilitators, seems to be needed.

TABLE I

DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON 1980-81
GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

1980-81 Gifted and Talented Student Participants

Grade in School	N	% of Total Participants
Pre School	1	.01
Kindergarten	9	.7
First	133	10.8
Second	149	12.1
Third	118	9.6
Fourth	164	13.4
Fifth	246	20.0
Sixth	157	12.8
Seventh	117	9.5
Eighth	130	10.6
Unknown	3	.2
Total	1,227	

Gender	N	% of Total Participants
Males	548	44.7
Females	676	55.1
Total	1,227 -	(Different Total)

Race	N	% of Total Participants
White	908	74.0
Black	209	17.0
Indian	46	3.7
Asian	34	2.8
Hispanic	19	1.5
Other	5	.4

IDENTIFICATION TECHNIQUES USED

Intelligence Test	N	Percentage
Binet	255	20.8
Otis	199	16.2
Other	71	5.8
WISC-R	46	3.7
ITPA	1	.1
Goodenough	1	.1
Not Available	659	53.3

Note: IQ scores which were available ranged from 90 to 161, with a mean of 124.01; mode of 119; and median of 123.

ACHVT Test	N	Percentage
CAT	506	41.2
CTBS	419	34.1
METRO	69	5.6
Other	68	5.5
Not Available	165	13.4

Note: Available achievement percentile scores ranged from 1 to 99, within a mode of 99 and median of 91.

Professional Nomination	N	Percentage
Teacher	989	80.6
Principal	59	4.8
Other	37	3.0
Counselor	2	.2
Not Available	137	11.2

Parent Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	280	22.8
No	824	67.2
Unavailable	123	1.0

Peer Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	50	4.1
No	1024	83.5
Unavailable	153	12.5

Aptitude Test	N	Percentage
Other	155	12.6
Multiple Apt. Battery	105	8.6
Art Ability	14	1.1
Mental Ability	2	.2
Unavailable	951	77.5

Self Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	170	13.9
No	891	72.6
Unavailable	166	13.6

(continue on next page)

Creativity Test	N	Percentage
Other	202	16.5
Torrance	103	8.4
Remote Assoc.	3	.2
Unavailable	919	74.9

Interest Inventory	N	Percentage
Other	343	28.0
Kuder	2	.2
IDEAS	2	.2
Unavailable	880	71.7

Classroom Performance		N	Percentage
Top	10	742	60.5
	20	213	17.4
	30	96	7.8
	40	51	4.2
	50	19	1.5
Bottom	50	12	1.0
Unavailable		94	7.7

Specific Aptitude	N	Percentage
Intellectual	802	65.4
Visual Arts	103	8.4
Creativity	92	7.5
Other	82	6.7
Perf. Arts	68	5.5
Leader	21	1.7
Cr. Writing	13	1.1
Unavailable	46	3.8

TABLE II

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

A. Days Gifted and Talented facilitators spent in classroom:

Average = 24.91

B. Hours Gifted and Talented facilitators spent in classroom per visit:

Average = 1.7

C. Number of individual educational plans (IEP's) devised:

	N	%
Yes	191	15.6
No	1031	84.0
Unavailable	5	.4

D. Number of students whose Gifted and Talented curriculum was subject related;

	N	%
Yes	1101	89.7
No	116	9.5
Unavilable	1	.1

E. Number of students having a process oriented curriculum;

	N	%
Yes	1157	94.3
No	58	4.7
Unavailable	1	.1

F. Number of students having a "doing centered" curriculum;

	N	%
Yes	1215	99.0
No	1	.1
Unavailable	11	.9

G. Number of students having an open-ended program;

	N	%
Yes	1052	85.7
No	133	10.8
Unavailable	42	3.4

H. Number of students having special teachers other than facilitor:

	N	%
Yes	705	57.5
No	430	35.0
Unavailable	92	7.5

I. Number of students having instructional program provided:

	N	%
Yes	1075	34.4
No	168	13.7
Unavailable	24	2.0

J. Number of students for whom support services were most frequently provided by the;

	N	%
School District	530	43.2
School Site	275	22.4
Fac. Pers. Funds	83	6.8
Community	82	6.7
Other	35	2.9
Not Receiving	186	15.2
Unavailable	36	2.9

K. Number of students who received most materials from the:

	N	%
School District	899	73.3
School Site	288	18.6
Fac. Pers. Funds	61	5.0
Unavailable	39	3.2

L. Was a learning setting provided for the Gifted and Talented student;

	N	%
Yes	1189	96.9
No	27	2.2
Unavailable	11	.9

M. Was this student provided with gifted experiences in the regular classes?

	N	%
Yes	862	70.3
No	285	23.2
Unavailable	80	6.5

N. Was this student provided with gifted experiences in a special class?

	N	%
Yes	1195	97.4
No	15	1.2
Unavailable	17	1.4

O. Was this student provided with individual instruction?

	N	%
Yes	1056	86.1
No	147	12.0
Unavailable	24	2.0

P. Was this student provided with group instruction?

	N	%
Yes	1210	98.6
No	1	.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

Q. Was creativity emphasized in some lesson for the student?

	N	%
Yes	1173	95.6
No	38	3.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

(continue on next page)

R. Was critical thinking emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1125	91.7
No	86	7.0
Unavailable	16	1.3

S. Was evaluative thinking emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1128	91.9
No	83	6.8
Unavailable	16	1.3

T. Was leadership emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	889	72.5
No	321	26.2
Unavailable	17	1.4

U. Was career exploration emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	744	60.6
No	467	38.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

V. Was individual growth in major subject area in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1097	89.4
No	114	9.3
Unavailable	16	1.3

W. Was individual growth in fine arts emphasized in some lessons for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1127	91.9
No	84	6.8
Unavailable	16	1.3

X. Were methods, materials, and activities, distinct, different, and in addition to gifted and talented students?

	N	%
Yes	1160	94.5
No	9	.7
Unavailable	58	4.7

Y. Was the student Gifted or Talented?

	N	%
Gifted	892	72.7
Talented	335	27.3

Note: This forced choice did not allow for the reality that some students were both gifted and talented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Executive Summary	1
I.	Background	1
	Evaluation Plan	2
II.	Findings	3
	Conclusions from the Survey and Interviews	8
	Limitations	11
III.	Recommendations	12
	Bibliography	13
	Appendix A	14
	Appendix B	20

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Descriptive Data on 1980-81 Gifted and Talented Program Participants	4
II.	Characteristics of the Instructional Program	6

CHAPTER ONE

THE GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM 1980-81

Background of the Gifted and Talented Program in the Oklahoma City Public Schools

In May of 1976, the Oklahoma City Board of Education received an outline of a proposal from the State Department of Education for pilot programs in gifted education. Subsequently, a committee of principals, teachers, and members of the Curriculum Department was created to study the feasibility of a gifted and talented program. Information reviewed and compiled by this committee was then presented to the Board of Education on November 22, 1976. Among the information presented, was the recommendation to establish pilot programs in three elementary (K-4), school or 5th year centers.

This recommendation was approved with the first three gifted and talented programs being established at Ridgeview, Gatewood, and Spencer during the remainder of the 1979-80 school year. Following these, was a fourth program at Wilson Elementary in the 1977-78 school year. During the interim between 1978 and 1980, there was also a Title IV-C federally funded pilot program for gifted students at Southeast High School; however, that program expired, due to a lack of continued funding.

At present, the gifted and talented program has expanded to fifteen elementary schools, seven fifth-year centers, and six middle schools. A July 1, 1981, state mandate will mean that in the future, all schools must offer a program for gifted and talented students.

Characteristics of the Present Program

The guidelines for the Oklahoma City Public Schools Gifted and Talented Program, are presented fully in Appendix A. In summary, the 1980-81 program was to provide a variety of enrichment experiences to develop students to their full potential. Activities were to be tailored to each student's individual needs. Minority and limited English proficiency students were to be included in the 1,000 students to be served.

To find potential Gifted and Talented students, a combination of methods were to be utilized. These are described in detail in Appendix A (pp. 21-22). In summary parent, professional and student nominations; achievement, aptitude and interest test results; and students' performance and interests were to be used. The final decision about who was to be selected for the program was to be made by a placement team.

Design of the Study

As outlined in Appendix B, the study centered around the use of a survey to gather descriptive data about the population served, as well as data indicating the methods which were used to identify potential participants. Instructional strategies were also identified. The evaluator felt that these data could help program staff to explore the options and compare the program to state guidelines prior to decisions about the 1981-82 Gifted and Talented Program.

In preparation for data collection, the evaluator met with the facilitators during four of their monthly meetings in October and November of 1980. Also, all gifted and talented facilitators were visited at least once at their school sites.

CHAPTER TWO

Findings

Table I gives a breakdown of Gifted and Talented students by grade, gender, and race. It also shows the techniques used to identify the participants. Table II describes characteristics of the instructional program.

Highlights from the table are shown below as program characteristics. (Note: These are not presented as "strengths" or "weaknesses" -- but as features in a flexible program that is continually developing statewide, as reflected in recent legislation. The purpose in presenting these descriptors is to help program staff to know "what is" before planning for changes.)

- The 1980-81 district gifted and talented program included approximately 11% of the total population for all schools having the program.
- There are approximately ten percent more females in the district gifted and talented program than males.
- The district gifted and talented program is approximately 74% white, compared to 53.9% white students enrolled for the entire school district.
- There are more Stanford-Binet intelligent test scores available for gifted students in the 1980-81 program, than any other intelligent test scores.
- More students were identified using the CAT Language Expression percentile than other scores or achievement tests.
- Teacher nomination was used for most students (80.6%) in the gifted and talented program. It was also the most frequently used form of nomination.
- Most students in the program (77.5%) were not given aptitude tests.

TABLE I

DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON 1980-81
GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

1980-81 Gifted and Talented Student Participants

Grade in School	N	% of Total Participants
Pre School	1	.01
Kindergarten	9	.7
First	133	10.8
Second	149	12.1
Third	118	9.6
Fourth	164	13.4
Fifth	246	20.0
Sixth	157	12.8
Seventh	117	9.5
Eighth	130	10.6
Unknown	3	.2
Total	1,227	

Gender	N	% of Total Participants
Males	548	44.7
Females	676	55.1
Total	1,227 -	(Different Total)

Race	N	% of Total Participants
White	908	74.0
Black	209	17.0
Indian	46	3.7
Asian	34	2.8
Hispanic	19	1.5
Other	5	.4

IDENTIFICATION TECHNIQUES USED

Intelligence Test	N	Percentage
Binet	255	20.8
Otis	199	16.2
Other	71	5.8
WISC-R	46	3.7
ITPA	1	.1
Goodenough	1	.1
Not Available	659	53.3

Note: IQ scores which were available ranged from 90 to 161, with a mean of 124.01; mode of 119; and median of 123.

ACHVT Test	N	Percentage
CAT	506	41.2
CTBS	419	34.1
METRO	69	5.6
Other	68	5.5
Not Available	165	13.4

Note: Available achievement percentile scores ranged from 1 to 99, within a mode of 99 and median of 91.

Professional Nomination	N	Percentage
Teacher	989	80.6
Principal	59	4.8
Other	37	3.0
Counselor	2	.2
Not Available	137	11.2

Parent Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	280	22.8
No	824	67.2
Unavailable	123	1.0

Peer Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	50	4.1
No	1024	83.5
Unavailable	153	12.5

Aptitude Test	N	Percentage
Other	155	12.6
Multiple Apt. Battery	105	8.6
Art Ability	14	1.1
Mental Ability	2	.2
Unavailable	951	77.5

Self Nomination	N	Percentage
Yes	170	13.9
No	891	72.6
Unavailable	166	13.6

(continue on next page)

Creativity Test	N	Percentage
Other	202	16.5
Torrance	103	8.4
Remote Assoc.	3	.2
Unavailable	919	74.9

Interest Inventory	N	Percentage
Other	343	28.0
Kuder	2	.2
IDEAS	2	.2
Unavailable	880	71.7

Classroom Performance		N	Percentage
Top	10	742	60.5
	20	213	17.4
	30	96	7.8
	40	51	4.2
	50	19	1.5
Bottom	50	12	1.0
Unavailable		94	7.7

Specific Aptitude	N	Percentage
Intellectual	802	65.4
Visual Arts	103	8.4
Creativity	92	7.5
Other	82	6.7
Perf. Arts	68	5.5
Leader	21	1.7
Cr. Writing	13	1.1
Unavailable	46	3.8

TABLE II

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

A. Days Gifted and Talented facilitators spent in classroom;

Average = 24.91

B. Hours Gifted and Talented facilitators spent in classroom per visit;

Average = 1.7

C. Number of individual educational plans (IEP's) devised;

	N	%
Yes	191	15.6
No	1031	84.0
Unavailable	5	.4

D. Number of students whose Gifted and Talented curriculum was subject related;

	N	%
Yes	1101	89.7
No	116	9.5
Unavilable	1	.1

E. Number of students having a process oriented curriculum;

	N	%
Yes	1157	94.3
No	58	4.7
Unavailable	1	.1

F. Number of students having a "doing centered" curriculum;

	N	%
Yes	1215	99.0
No	1	.1
Unavailable	11	.9

G. Number of students having an open-ended program;

	N	%
Yes	1052	85.7
No	133	10.8
Unavailable	42	3.4

H. Number of students having special teachers other than facilitor:

	N	%
Yes	705	57.5
No	430	35.0
Unavailable	92	7.5

I. Number of students having instructional program provided:

	N	%
Yes	1035	84.4
No	168	13.7
Unavailable	24	2.0

J. Number of students for whom support services were most frequently provided by the;

	N	%
School District	530	43.2
School Site	275	22.4
Fac. Pers. Funds	83	6.8
Community	82	6.7
Other	35	2.9
Not Receiving	186	15.2
Unavailable	36	2.9

K. Number of students who received most materials from the:

	N	%
School District	899	73.3
School Site	288	18.6
Fac. Pers. Funds	61	5.0
Unavailable	39	3.2

L. Was a learning setting provided for the Gifted and Talented student;

	N	%
Yes	1189	96.9
No	27	2.2
Unavailable	11	.9

M. Was this student provided with gifted experiences in the regular classes?

	N	%
Yes	862	70.3
No	285	23.2
Unavailable	80	6.5

N. Was this student provided with gifted experiences in a special class?

	N	%
Yes	1195	97.4
No	15	1.2
Unavailable	17	1.4

O. Was this student provided with individual instruction?

	N	%
Yes	1056	86.1
No	147	12.0
Unavailable	24	2.0

P. Was this student provided with group instruction?

	N	%
Yes	1210	98.6
No	1	.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

Q. Was creativity emphasized in some lesson for the student?

	N	%
Yes	1173	95.6
No	38	3.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

(continue on next page)

R. Was critical thinking emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1125	91.7
No	86	7.0
Unavailable	16	1.3

S. Was evaluative thinking emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1128	91.9
No	83	6.8
Unavailable	16	1.3

T. Was leadership emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	889	72.5
No	321	26.2
Unavailable	17	1.4

U. Was career exploration emphasized in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	744	60.6
No	467	38.1
Unavailable	16	1.3

V. Was individual growth in major subject area in some lesson for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1097	89.4
No	114	9.3
Unavailable	16	1.3

W. Was individual growth in fine arts emphasized in some lessons for this student?

	N	%
Yes	1127	91.9
No	84	6.8
Unavailable	16	1.3

X. Were methods, materials, and activities, distinct, different, and in addition to gifted and talented students?

	N	%
Yes	1160	94.5
No	9	.7
Unavailable	58	4.7

Y. Was the student Gifted or Talented?

	N	%
Gifted	892	72.7
Talented	335	27.3

Note: This forced choice did not allow for the reality that some students were both gifted and talented.

- Most students in the program (75%), were not given creativity tests.

- Most students in the program (71.7%), were not given interest inventories.

- Seven hundred forty-two (60.5%) students in the program were listed by the facilitator as being in the top ten percent of their class.

- A majority (72.7%) of students in the program were labeled as gifted (having a strong intellected aptitude), with the remaining being considered as talented.

- The median IQ for all students for whom scores were available was 123.

- The median achievement percentile, for all students in the program was 91.

- 84% of the gifted and talented program students did not have individual educational program (IEP's).

Conclusions from the Survey and Interviews

Ability Areas Used

All ability areas were included in the district program; specifically:

- Intellectual
- Creative thinking
- Leadership
- Visual Arts
- Performing Arts
- Creative Writing
- Other Specific Aptitude

However, as individual school profiles show, in some schools, the pattern was restricted to only a few areas.

Placement

Within the district, there was extensive use of group or individual tests of intelligence and achievement, teacher nomination, information from

parents, school grades, rating scales, scholastic aptitude tests, interest inventories, or nominations by professional staff to identify students. Again, some schools were much more limited in the number of criteria applied and interviews with Gifted and Talented facilitators indicate that some programs did not have placement teams. Although the racial balance in the program was not the same as in the district, it seemed to the evaluator that a concerted effort was made to include minority and limited English proficiency students, both district-wide and in each school.

Activities

Teachers described activities for gifted and talented students in the district as ranging from 85% to 100%:

A. Subject related (Activities which indicate thinking and doing.)

B. Process-oriented (Emphasize thinking skills and process rather than acquiring information.)

C. Doing-centered (Focus on active involvement for the students.)

D. Open-ended application (Allow for varied, personalized response.)

E. Student-selected (Options which allow for individual needs, preferences, and capabilities.)

Interviews with facilitators further documented this as being typical of individual school programs.

Responses from facilitators and teachers also showed agreement that special materials, methods, and activities were chosen for the Gifted and Talented students distinct, different, and in addition to, those provided for the rest of the students throughout the school year. The teacher survey in-

dicated that time was allowed for some of the facilitators to work and plan with the regular classroom teacher. However some facilitors showed zero days and zero hours for this to take place.

For 15% of the students a gifted and talented program was tailored to the student's needs and abilities (regardless of age, location, ethnic background, or economic circumstances), by the conclusion of the school year. According to surveys and interviews the Gifted and Talented program also provided special teachers, instructional programs, supportive services, materials, learning settings, experiences in regular classrooms, and experiences in special classrooms. This appeared to be typical of all schools, as well as the district.

Responses to the survey show that, for most schools, as well as the district, the Gifted and Talented program consisted of an open-ended curriculum which included individualized and group instruction in: crestivity, critical thinking, evaluative thinking, leadership, career exploration, and individual growth in major subject areas, as well as dance, art, and drama.

Development and Dissemination

Information about the program has been distributed by the Public Information Office and Curriculum Department. Also, one middle school distributed a commercially developed pamphlet covering informational items on its gifted and talented program. Other schools sent letters and received publicity through various media.

According to curriculum personnel, a plan to accomodate all of the schools in the district with a Gifted and Talented program is being developed. It will be implemented in yearly increments beginning in 1981-82, with the maximum length of time being three years.

Limitations

In interviews with facilitators it was noted that, while most building administrators were supportive of the program, some were not. A need to clarify administrative roles (whether the building administrator or curriculum administration controlled and supervised the program) was expressed also.

CHAPTER THREE

Recommendations

- A number of students who were eligible last year will not be eligible under recent legislation. Therefore, the district will need to move toward identification procedures which are consistent with the revised state policy.

- It was recommended by facilitators that they be given testing in-service.

- Intensive dissemination and training in the new state guidelines and effective communication with and among facilitators should be emphasized in the 1981-82 program.

- Further clarification of roles, particularly related to supervision of facilitators, seems to be needed.

Bibliography

Berger, Gilda, The Gifted and Talented Franklin Watts (Publisher), New York, 1980.

Gallagher, James, Teaching the Gifted Child, Second Edition, Allyn and Bacon, Inc, Boston, 1975.

Kaplan, Sandra, N., Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook, National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented, 1974.

Passow, A. Harry and Rehage, Kenneth J, Editors - (The Seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, University of Chicago Press, 1979.

APPENDIX A

August, 1980

Oklahoma City Public Schools
Educational Services Division

Independent School District #89 Guidelines
for the Gifted/Talented Program

I. Program

The purpose of the district's Gifted/Talented Program is to provide a variety of enrichment experiences and activities which will allow for development of gifted/talented students to their full potential.

The program will be tailored to each student's individual needs and abilities, regardless of age, location, ethnic background, or economic circumstances.

A concerted effort should be made to include minority and limited English-proficiency students in the program.

II. Current and Future Status

In the 1980-81 school year, there are G/T Programs in twenty-eight schools with seventeen full-time G/T facilitators. Included are fifteen elementary schools, seven 5th-year centers, and six middle schools.

As of July 1, 1981, the new state law mandates a G/T Program for all gifted and talented students. This means that a program will have to accommodate all of the schools in the district, including the high schools. At present, advanced elective courses and Advanced Placement courses are offered to high school students, plus a special program for gifted science students and intern or independent study projects for Fine Arts students.

III. Gifted/Talented Students Defined

Following Federal guidelines, Gifted/Talented students at the preschool, elementary and secondary levels are those who have shown the potential for performance at a high level and thus require educational experiences different from those provided in the regular school program. Ability areas of these students will include the intellectual, creative thinking, leadership, visual and performing arts, other specific aptitudes (such as creative writing), and any other abilities which can be identified.

IV. The Gifted/Talented Program Defined

The Gifted/Talented Program will provide special teachers, instructional programs, supportive services, materials, learning settings, and experiences in special and regular classrooms. This special program will supplement and support, yet be different from, the regular educational program to meet the special needs of all Gifted/Talented students.

V. Incidence

Using the U.S. Office of Education estimates of 3%-5% of the student population as gifted/talented, approximately 1,200 to over 2,000 of the district's students would qualify.

In the 1980-81 school year, approximately 1,000 students will be included in the district's Gifted/Talented Program.

VI. Program Design

The district Gifted/Talented Program will be modified to reflect the particular needs of the students in each school and to make use of the special talents and experiences of the G/T facilitator assigned to that school.

A major emphasis of the G/T Program will be that each K-5 facilitator will provide special program equipment and materials, and assistance and support the regular classroom teachers so that G/T students will be able to continue their special activities when they are in their classrooms. Middle school facilitators will work with team leaders and teachers to serve G/T students in their regular classrooms. Normally, G/T facilitators will spend at least an hour a day providing special materials and services to the regular classroom teachers who have G/T students in their classroom.

The district Gifted/Talented Program will consist of an enrichment program with an open-ended curriculum, which includes individualized and group instruction emphasizing creativity, critical thinking, evaluative thinking, leadership, career exploration and individual growth, not only in major subject areas (Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies) but an effort should also be made to include Fine Arts (Music, Dance, Art, Drama) material and activities in the program.

Courses may run for the length of a semester, but a more usual length will be for nine weeks, six weeks, or even less if some special skill or enrichment activity is involved.

The facilitator's teaching style should be as free, flexible and innovative as possible, allowing students maximum opportunities for learning as an enjoyable pursuit.

VII. Identification and Notification of Students

To find potential G/T students, a workable combination of the following methods should be used: group or individual tests of intelligence and achievement, teacher nomination, information from parents, school grades, rating scales, scholastic aptitude tests, interest inventories, nominations by professional staff, or other appropriate instruments.

Any student is eligible for the G/T Program if the following requirements are met: legal school age, in the upper 5% of student population or 1½ standard deviations above the mean on objective tests (or having the potential of either of these qualifications), or with evidence of special abilities. Special ability students will be selected by using multiple criteria, including <u>at least one item</u> from <u>each</u> of the following categories:

A. Nominations
   1. Professional nominations: checklist used by teachers, counselors, psychologists or other staff members
   2. Parent, peer, self-nomination

B. Measures of ability
   1. Aptitude/creative test suited to program
   2. General ability inventories (group or individual)
   3. Individual or group intelligence test

C. Performance/Interests
   1. Standardized achievement test suited to program
   2. Classroom performance (cumulative data)
   3. Normed or criterion-referenced interest inventories

The final decision about who will be selected for the G/T Program should be made by the evaluation-placement team.

A permission form will be sent to the parent(s) or guardian of the G/T student before enrolling the student in the program. The basic form developed for the G/T Program may be used (or some modification of the form based on the needs of the individual school).

If the student is dropped from the program for any reason, the parent(s) or guardian must be notified according to regular discipline policy.

VIII. The Evaluation-Placement Team

The evaluation-placement team may consist of the G/T facilitator, the principal (or assistant principal), regular classroom teachers, special teachers, a psychologist or psychometrist, counselors, parents, and other ability experts from the community

The team will evaluate procedures, instruments, and observations used for placement and will make final decisions about who will be included in the G/T Program.

In addition to a continuous review of each student's placement and progression in the G/T Program, each facilitator will provide to the parent(s) or guardian a written record of each student's progress at least twice a year. The time for this written assessment would be toward the end of each semester. In addition, scheduled conferences with the parent(s) or guardian are strongly encouraged.

IX. Number of Students Served

The number of G/T students in a particular school and in an individual class may vary widely. Usually, there will be a minimum of five students in each laboratory class, although work with individual students is allowed if the G/T facilitator can schedule that student without eliminating a larger group meeting. A normal maximum for a laboratory class would be 12-15 stude[illegible]

Space should be reserved in the program for special talent stu[illegible]ts (Music, Art, etc.) who will tend to be identified later in the year than the [illegible]fted students.

Time should be allowed for daily planning and working with regular classroom teachers.

X. Selection of Staff

A G/T facilitator should have a valid Oklahoma teaching certificate for grade levels served and a minimum of three years of teaching experience. Though not required, G/T college courses and/or experience in a G/T program is desirable. The teachers should be understanding of G/T students' gifts, teach with inspiration and flexiblity of classroom management, possess superior intellectual ability and broad cultural interests, be of sound mental health, with competency in classroom teaching, together with skill in stimulating independent study and creativity.

XI. Differentiated Curriculum

The curriculum for G/T students must be different from the education "of ALL students." (Quoted from Oklahoma "State Guidelines.")

These basic principals should be followed in planning the curriculum:

A. Subject-related (activities which initiate thinking and doing)
B. Process-oriented (emphasize thinking skills and process rather than acquiring information)
C. Doing-centered (focus on active involvement for the student)
D. Open-ended application (allow for varied, personalized responses)
E. Student-selected (options which allow for individual needs, preferences, and capabilities)

Scheduling must allow G/T students enough time to learn basic sequential skills in their regular classrooms.

Special materials, methods, and activities for G/T students must be distinct, different, and in addition to those provided for the rest of the students.

XII. Program Development

Regular one-half day meetings of the G/T consultant and the G/T facilitators will be held monthly.

A special workshop (one or two days in length) will be held early in the school year.

Additional special workshops may be held to involve G/T principals, State Department and local consultants, and other experts with the G/T facilitators in an effort to expand or improve the program.

XIII. Facilities and Resources

A laboratory setting designed for the purpose of promoting and encouraging G/T student interaction and creativity is encouraged.

In addition to adequate space for groups of up to fifteen G/T students, individual study and research areas should be provided. As many stimulating projects, puzzles, learning centers, special books and other written sources, plus regular G/T materials and equipment, should be displayed attractively in the room. As much as possible, objects which can be handled, moved about, or used in some way should be available. Any bulletin boards or other visual teaching aids should encourage student comments and alterations.

Specialists, consultants, parents, community experts, and others may be used in the program as long as the G/T facilitator is primarily responsible.

XIV. Transfer Policy for the Gifted/Talented Program

A. Transfers to schools with Gifted and Talented Programs shall be permitted provided:

1. Space is available in the program.
2. The student qualifies for the program.
3. The principal of the receiving school approves the transfer request.
4. Transportation is provided by the parent.
5. The student maintains satisfactory progress in the program.

B. Processing of Transfer Requests

1. Special transfer request forms will be obtained by the patron at the home school after the student has been recommended for the Gifted and Talented Program by the home school principal.

2. The principal of the school with the Gifted and Talented Program shall establish a committee to determine if applicants meet the criteria.
3. If the student is accepted for the program, the receiving principal shall sign the special transfer application in the upper right hand corner, and send to the Office of Attendance, Administration Building. The parent should be instructed to withdraw the student from the home school.
4. After the student has withdrawn from the home school, the receiving school may enroll the student.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM EVALUATION PLANNING SHEET

A. Program to be evaluated: Gifted and Talented (Grades 5-8)

B. What is the program designed to accomplish?

To provide a variety of enrichment experience and activities which will allow for development of gifted and talented students to their full potential.

C. What is the purpose of this evaluation?

To monitor progress towards program objectives for each school involved in the study.

D. Questions to ask:

1. Were all the ability areas used in each Gifted and Talented program for identification?

2. Did the Gifted and Talented placement team use group or individual tests of intelligence and achievement, teacher nomination, information from parents, school grades, rating scales, scholastic aptitude tests, interest inventories, or nominations by professional staff to identify students?

3. Did the Gifted and Talented placement team use at least one item from each of the following categories for identifying those students who did not score in the upper 5% or top 1½ stanines.

A. Nominations:

I. Professional nominations--checklist used by teachers, counselors, psychologists or other staff members.

II. Parents, peer, or self-nomination.

B. Measures of ability:

I. Aptitude/creative test suited to program.

II. General ability inventories (group or individual).

III. Individual or group intelligence test.

C. Performance/Interest:

I. Standardized Achievement Tests.

II. Classroom performance (cumulative data).

III. Normed or Criterion Referenced Inventory.

4. Was space reserved for special talent students (Music, Art, etc.) who will tend to be identified later in the year during the gifted and talented student selection process?

5. Was a concerted effort made to include minority and limited English-proficiency students in the gifted and talented program student selection process?

6. Were the following basic principles follwed for the gifted and talented activities selected throughout the school year:

A. Subject related (Activities which indicate thinking and doing.)

B. Process-oriented (Emphasize thinking skills and process rather than acquiring information.)

C. Doing-centered (Focus on active involvement for the students.)

D. Open-ended application (Allow for varied, personalized response.)

E. Student-selected (Options which allow for individual needs, preferences, and capabilities.)

7. Were special materials, methods, and activities chosen for the Gifted and Talented students distinct, different, and in addition to, those provided for the rest of the students throughout the school year?

8. Was time allowed for daily planning and working by the Gifted and Talented facilitator with the regular classroom teacher throughout the school year?

9. Was a gifted and talented program tailored to each student's student's needs and abilities, regardless of age, location, ethnic background, or economic circumstances, by the conclusion of the school year?

10. Did the Gifted and Talented program provide special teachers, instructional programs, supportive services, materials, learning settings, experiences in regular classrooms, and experiences in special classrooms, and experiences in special classrooms by the conclusion of the school year?

11. Did the district Gifted and Talented program consist of an open-ended curriculum which includes individualized and group instruction in: creativity, critical thinking, evaluative thinking, leadership, career exploration, and individual growth in major subject areas, as well as dance, art, and drama by the conclusion of the school year?

12. Was there a Gifted and Talented Plan developed by July 1, 1981, to accomodate all of the schools in the district, including high-schools?

13. Was tnere a dissemination of gifted and talented information to classroom teachers, principals, and patrons?

E. Information to gather:

1. Checklist of completed objectives by each school involved.

2. Interview with Gifted and Talented consultant.

3. Plan of schools served by Gifted and Talented

F. Population to assess:

1. All gifted and Talented facilitators.

2. Gifted and talented consulatant.

G. Assessment Instruments:

1. Will interview the facilitators during the monthly facilitator's meeting, starting with the month of December.

2. Will interview consultant near end of school year.

H. Assessment Dates:

1. Will interview the facilitators during the monthly facilitator's meeting, starting with the month of December.

2. Will interview consultant near end of school year.

I. Who collects the data?

1. Facilitators make appointment with research associate, and r.a. records information.

2. Research associate will interview the gifted and talented consultant.

J. Data analysis:

1. Percentiles

2. Median

3. Graphs

4. Tables

K. Reporting:

Information analyzed by the evaluator will be directed to the G/T consultant, the Coordinators of Curriculum (K-5) and (6-12), the Director of Curriculum Services, and the Superintendent's entire executive staff.

L. Expected use of information:

Evaluation data will be used to review the progress of the program, as well as to make recommendation for improvement.